

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claim 9 has been cancelled, while claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 9. In addition, claims 1 and 8 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner has allowed claims 10-16.


Applicant submits that while claims 1-8 arguably include a mathematical algorithm, independent claims 1 and 8 fall within one of the safe harbors indicated in MPEP 2106. In particular, claims 1 and 8 include "receiving as an input an original video sequence" and "processing the original video sequence to derive a sharpened video sequence" to be performed prior to processing the putative mathematical algorithm, and "re-processing the original video sequence using said objective sharpness quality score to derive an optimized sharpened video sequence" to be performed after processing the putative mathematical algorithm.

Applicant submits that the last step "re-processing the original video sequence using said objective sharpness quality score to derive an optimized sharpened video sequence" finds support in the specification as filed on page 13, paragraph [0044].

In view of the above, Applicant believes that claims 1-8 are indeed statutory, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-8 and 10-16, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by   
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611